

REMARKS

Claims 1-6, 9-11, 13-20 and 31-35 are pending. In the final Office Action mailed July 19, 2004, the Examiner rejected claims 1-6, 9-16, 19-23, 25, 27 and 29 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being anticipated by WO 01/52447 A2 ("Judd"). The Examiner rejected claims 17-18, 24, 26, 28 and 30-31 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Judd in view of the Examiner's official notice. The Examiner rejected claims 32-33 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Judd in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2002/0159551 ("Ekvetchavit"). The Examiner rejected claims 34-35 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Judd in view of the Examiner's official notice as evidenced by U.S. Patent No. 6,718,160 ("Schmutz").

I. Rejection of Independent Claim 1 and 11

Applicant's independent claim 1 is generally directed toward a propagation system for extending into an enclosure a wireless coverage area provided by a base station that is located outside the enclosure. The propagation system includes an integrated propagation relay, which can communicate with the base station via at least one antenna in a first set of wireless signals. The integrated propagation relay also includes a frequency converter for converting between the first set of frequencies and a second set of frequencies. Claim 1 has been amended to clarify that the at least one antenna and the frequency converter are located within a single housing. That is, the integrated propagation relay is not simply a connection of multiple, separate components, but rather is one device within a single housing. The propagation system also includes a first mobile station interface port that is located in the enclosure, and the first mobile station interface port can communicate directly with the integrated propagation relay in the second set of frequencies. It may also communicate with another entity, such as a wireless device, in the first set of frequencies.

Judd generally shows a system for distribution of wireless services within a building. Various antenna 110a, 110b, 110c can receive different wireless signals that are converted to Ethernet signals and provided to an Ethernet hub 112. The Ethernet hub 112 then forwards those signals to a separate device - a flat-panel repeater 113 - that in turn forwards the signals to other repeaters 114, 115. The other repeaters 114, 115 then send the signals directly to wireless devices. The Ethernet signals from the repeaters 114, 115 might also be received by an Ethernet-to-PCS conversion unit 119 that converts the Ethernet signals to PCS signals for transmission to PCS devices.

The Examiner asserted that the combination of several elements in Judd together form the functionality of Applicant's integrated propagation relay. Specifically, the flat panel repeater 113 is a separate element than the Ethernet hub 112. The flat panel repeater 113 even communicates with the Ethernet hub 112 via an Ethernet connection, which is a relatively complicated connection used to network various separate components together rather than for internal communication of components within the same device. (Fig 23a; pg. 17, lines 20-25). Applicant's previous response detailed why Judd does not teach or suggest Applicant's claims.

In response to Applicant's prior arguments, the Examiner stated that the separate elements are connected, and therefore they are integrated. The Examiner went on to state that the Applicant is arguing the form of the integrated propagation relay but that the claims do not limit the form of the integrated propagation relay. Applicant has amended claim 1 to clarify the structure of the integrated propagation relay in this regard, and as amended claim 1 makes clear that the integrated propagation relay's at least one antenna and its frequency converter are located in a single housing. This is neither taught nor suggested by Judd. And, in fact, Judd teaches away from any such modification.

Judd makes clear that the "flat-panel repeater comprises a closely spaced stacked array of planar components that form a compact unit that can be easily mounted...." (pg. 8, lines 29-30). Judd then goes

on to describe preferred dimensions, all less than 24 inches and some as small as 2 inches, for the flat panel repeater 113. The compact nature of the flat panel repeater 113 allows it to be easily mounted at various locates without taking up too much space and also allows the flat panel repeater 113 to be mounted flush on a wall or other surface. Not only does Judd not teach or suggest combining the flat panel repeater 113, the Ethernet Hub 112 and the antenna 110a-c into an integrated component, it teaches away from any such modification that would add components to the flat panel repeater 113, thereby resulting in a larger overall component that does not have the advantages that Judd teaches for the flat panel repeater 113.


Thus, Judd does not teach or suggest an integrated propagation relay having at least one antenna and a frequency converter located within a single housing, as is claimed by Applicant. Accordingly, independent claim 1 and dependent claims 2-6, 9-10 and 31-35 are allowable. Independent claim 11 has been amended to include the elements of claim 12, and includes elements similar to claim 1. Therefore, independent claim 11 dependent claims 13-20 are also allowable.

III. Conclusion

Applicant submits that proposed amendment and remarks place this application in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the Examiner enter these amendments and issue a Notice of Allowability. If any questions or issues remain, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' attorney, Brian Harris, at his direct dial number (312) 913-3303.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 9/20/04

By: 
Brian R. Harris
Registration No. 45,900

McDonnell Boehnen Hulbert & Berghoff LLP
300 South Wacker Drive, 31st Floor
Chicago, IL 60606
(312) 913-0001 (phone)
(312) 913-0002 (fax)

11